

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3 TESSERA, INC., No. C 05-4063 CW

4 Plaintiff, ORDER OVERRULING

5 v. DEFENDANTS'

6 ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC.; OBJECTIONS TO

7 SPANSION, LLC; SPANSION, INC; NONDISPOSITIVE

8 SPANSION TECHNOLOGY, INC.; ORDER OF THE

9 ADVANCED SEMICONDUCTOR SPECIAL MASTER

10 ENGINEERING, INC.; ASE (U.S.), (Docket Nos. 1098

11 INC.; CHIPMOS TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; in Case No.

12 CHIPMOS U.S.A., INC.; SILICONWARE 05-4063 and 228 in

13 PRECISION INDUSTRIES CO., LTD.; Case No. 12-692)

14 SILICONWARE USA, INC.;

15 STMICROELECTRONICS N.V.;

16 STMICROELECTRONICS, INC.; STATS

17 CHIPPAC, INC.; STATS CHIPPAC

18 (BVI), LTD.; and STATS CHIPPAC,

19 LTD.,

20 Defendants.

21 \_\_\_\_\_ / No. C 12-692 CW

22 TESSERA, INC.,

23 Plaintiff,

24 v.

25 MOTOROLA, INC.; QUALCOMM, INC.;

26 FREESCALE SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.;

27 and ATI TECHNOLOGIES, ULC,

28 Defendants.

29 \_\_\_\_\_ /

30 AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS

31 \_\_\_\_\_ /

32 Defendants Siliconware Precision Industries Co., Ltd. and

33 Siliconware USA, Inc., STATS ChipPAC, Inc., STATS ChipPAC (BVI)

34 Limited and STATS ChipPAC, Ltd., Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.,

35 Advanced Micro Devices, Inc., ATI Technologies ULC, Spansion, LLC,

36 Spansion, Inc., Spansion Technology, Inc., ChipMOS U.S.A., Inc.,

1 ChipMOS Technologies, Inc., STMicroelectronics, Inc. and  
2 STMicroelectronics N.V. object to a nondispositive discovery order  
3 of the Special Master issued on October 24, 2012, which addresses  
4 disclosure of confidential information to overseas experts. The  
5 Court considers Defendants' objections de novo and OVERRULES them.  
6 Docket Nos. 1098 in Case No. 05-4063 and 228 in Case No. 12-692.

7 Defendants challenge the Special Master's order on three  
8 bases. First, they argue that section 7.8 of the stipulated  
9 interim protective order precludes counsel from sending  
10 confidential information outside the United States to anyone,  
11 including to experts, and does not just limit its transmission to  
12 foreign attorneys. However, by its terms, section 7.8 restricts  
13 only counsel from taking, removing, or accessing confidential  
14 documents outside of the United States, and does not address  
15 whether experts may access confidential information located on a  
16 secure ftp site while they are outside the United States. By  
17 placing the material on a secure ftp site located in the United  
18 States, counsel does not "take, access or remove (via electronic  
19 means or otherwise)" the material outside the United States,  
20 although if foreign attorneys working on the cases were to access  
21 confidential information on the ftp site while outside of the  
22 United States, this may constitute a violation of section 7.8.

23 Further, section 7.5 supports the Special Master's  
24 interpretation. In that section, the parties clearly prohibited  
25 certain material from being "removed, accessed, taken or allowed  
26 to be taken outside the United States" by anyone. The parties  
27 could have, but did not, make this provision broad enough to  
28 encompass all confidential material, or material produced by one

1 party that, by contract with a third party, was restricted from  
2 removal outside of the United States. Further, if section 7.8 is  
3 read as Defendants contend it should be, separate references to  
4 "export controlled" material, including section 7.8, would be  
5 rendered surplusage.

6 Second, Defendants argue that the Special Master erred by  
7 applying section 7.6, which deals with objections to experts  
8 themselves, to this dispute, and ignoring section 7.8. Defendants  
9 argue that section 7.6 is inapplicable, because they were not  
10 objecting to the use of the foreign experts in their entirety and  
11 that section deals with "resolving disputes involving objections  
12 to experts themselves." Mot. at 4. Instead, they state that they  
13 merely are arguing that much of the discovery material cannot be  
14 given to the foreign experts for analysis.

15 The Special Master correctly found that section 7.6 is  
16 applicable here. According to its title, section 7.6 sets forth  
17 "procedures for approving disclosure of 'confidential,' 'highly  
18 confidential--attorneys' eyes only,' or 'highly confidential  
19 financial--attorneys' eyes only' information or items to experts,"  
20 precisely what Tessera seeks here. A party may object that  
21 disclosure of confidential material to an expert is inappropriate  
22 for a variety of reasons. For example, a party may argue that  
23 "disclosure is not reasonably necessary for this litigation" as  
24 required by section 7.2(c). However, any objection to the  
25 disclosure of confidential material is governed by the procedures  
26 outlined in section 7.6, even if another section is also relevant  
27 to the dispute. Further, as discussed above and by the Special  
28 Master, section 7.8 is inapplicable. Finally, even if Defendants'

1 characterization of this section were accepted, in practical  
2 terms, their objection would mean that Tessera is unable to use  
3 certain individuals as experts in these cases.

4 Third, Defendants contend that the Special Master improperly  
5 ignored the issue of providing notice to third parties regarding  
6 the possible disclosure of their information overseas. Defendants  
7 argue that these third parties had "a legitimate expectation that  
8 their [confidential business information] would be protected  
9 pursuant to Section 7.8 and other sections of the" protective  
10 order. However, as stated above, other than for "export  
11 controlled" information, these third parties did not have a  
12 reasonable expectation that their information would never be taken  
13 outside the United States under any circumstances whatsoever.  
14 Further, although Defendants generally aver that there are such  
15 entities, they never specifically identify any such third parties,  
16 who were not also parties to this case and who had not received  
17 notice and an opportunity to be heard. In addition, under section  
18 7.4 of the protective order, when Defendants believed that their  
19 disclosure of information to Tessera might violate a  
20 confidentiality obligation owed to a nonparty, they were required  
21 to provide written notification to the nonparty, and then inform  
22 Tessera if they received a response to the notification. Although  
23 Defendants may not have believed that their disclosure of this  
24 material to Tessera violated such an obligation at the time it was  
25 initially provided, if Defendants reasonably believed that  
26 disclosure did so after Tessera informed them of its  
27 interpretation of the protective order, Defendants could have  
28 provided notice to the nonparties. Defendants have offered no

1 evidence that they have done so or that they have received any  
2 objections from the nonparties. Finally, the Special Master did  
3 not ignore the potential concerns of the third parties. He  
4 specifically found that the security procedures identified by  
5 Tessera "are reasonable to preserve the confidentiality of the  
6 information, including defendants own information and any  
7 information from their clients that is contained therein." Docket  
8 No. 1095 in Case No. 05-4063, 3.

9 Defendants' objections are overruled.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11  
12 Dated: November 21, 2012

  
13 CLAUDIA WILKEN  
14 United States District Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28